UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,801	02/04/2000	David Angelo Ferrucci	YO999-201	7921

21254   7590   11/24/2004

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER
HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/497,801	FERRUCCI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Doug Hutton	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,21 and 25-37* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,21 and 25-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 February 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 14 June 2004, Applicant amended Claims 1-3, 21 and 25, added new Claims 26-37, cancelled Claims 8-20 and 22-24, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 11 March 2004.

The 102 rejections based on Leymaster are withdrawn. All objections previously set forth are withdrawn.

Claim Interpretation

For the record, here is the examiner's interpretation of confusingly-worded terms recited in the claims:

➤ *"domain knowledge"* — inside a database of objects, objects used to construct documents in a document assembly system (text, scripts, etc.);

➤ *"document knowledge"* — in the document assembly system, the input (type of document, party names, addresses, etc.) provided by a user prior to the construction of the document; said input collected via a series of questions presented to said user via a graphical user interface;

➤ *"domain model"* — the database of objects previously mentioned; said objects in said database are used to construct documents in the document assembly system;

➢ *"document knowledge variable"* — in the series of questions previously

mentioned, a single question and the corresponding answer;

➢ *"domain knowledge elements"* — in the database of objects previously

mentioned, objects used to construct documents in a document assembly system

(text, scripts, etc.); in other words, this is simply a synonym for "domain

knowledge;" and

➢ *"domain knowledge element property"* — in the database of objects previously

mentioned, a property associated with one of the objects.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term "by" on Page 10, Line 13 should be deleted so that the sentence reads

more clearly;

- in the amendment to the first paragraph of the Specification submitted in

Applicant's Response:

o every application serial number, name of invention and filing date in this

paragraph should be checked and amended if incorrect.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "the document model" in Line 4 should be amended because no "document model" is previously mentioned in the claims.

Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "(ORAL)" should be inserted after the term "language" in Line 3 because the acronym is used in subsequent claims (see Claims 33-36).

Claims 33-36 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- everywhere it is used in the claims, the term "oral" should be amended to — ORAL — because it is an acronym for "object representation and access language" recited in a previous claim (see Claim 32, Line 3).

Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term "then" should be inserted between the terms "identifier," and "the" in Line 2 because the action in the second phrase is performed only if the condition recited in the first phrase is satisfied (see Specification – Page 13, Line 19 through Page 14, Line 2).

Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "expression, the" in Line 2 should be amended to — expression and the — because the first two phrases of the claim recite conditions that must be fulfilled before the actions recited in the third and fourth phrases are performed (see Specification – Page 13, Line 19 through Page 14, Line 2); and

- the term "then" should be inserted between the terms "element," and "the" in Line 3 because the actions recited in the third and fourth phrases are performed only if the conditions recited in the first and second phrases are satisfied (see Specification – Page 13, Line 19 through Page 14, Line 2).

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the comma between the terms "expression" and "and" in Line 2 should be removed because the first two phrases of the claim recite conditions that must be fulfilled before the action recited in the third phrase is performed (see Specification – Page 14, Lines 3-5); and

- the term "then" should be inserted between the terms "element," and "said" in Line 3 because the action recited in the third phrase is performed only if the conditions in the first and second phrases are satisfied (see Specification – Page 14, Lines 3-5).

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the comma between the terms "identifier" and "and" in Line 2 should be removed because the first two phrases of the claim recite conditions that must be fulfilled

before the action recited in the third phrase is performed (see Specification –

Page 14, Lines 6-7); and

* the term "then" should be inserted between the terms "element," and "said" in

Line 2 because the action recited in the third phrase is performed only if the

conditions recited in the first and second phrases are satisfied (see Specification

– Page 14, Lines 6-7).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 32:

Claim 32 recites the limitation "wherein said document knowledge *variables* are

linked to said domain knowledge *elements* by selecting a *specific property* from the

domain model by an object representation and access language" in Lines 1-3. This

limitation is indefinite because it is unclear whether *multiple* document knowledge

variables are linked to *multiple* domain knowledge elements by selecting a **single**

specific property or by selecting a single specific property for *each* variable and

element.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by amending the limitation to — wherein said

document knowledge variables are linked to said domain knowledge elements by

selecting specific properties from the domain model by an object representation and

access language —.

For purposes of examination, the examiner will assume that the limitation reads

per the suggested amendment.

Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 33-36:

Claim 33 recites the limitation "wherein if *said oral expression* comprises a single

identifier, *the oral expression* corresponds to a domain knowledge element" in Lines 1-

2. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear to which oral expression the

limitation refers. Claim 32, from which Claim 33 depends, recites a "plurality of oral

expressions" (see Claim 32, Lines 4-5).

Applicant may obviate this rejection by amending the limitation to — wherein if a

first ORAL expression of said ORAL expressions comprises a single identifier, then said

first ORAL expression corresponds to a domain knowledge element —.

For purposes of examination, the examiner will assume that the limitation reads

per the suggested amendment.

Claims 34-36 have the same problem.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 21 and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Porter, U.S. Patent No. 6,473,892.

Claim 1:

Porter discloses a method of linking domain knowledge to document knowledge

(see Figures 1-10; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 20, Line 34 – Porter discloses

this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text), comprising:

- rendering document knowledge as textual components with variable fields (the

  examiner interprets this limitation to mean that the user of a document assembly

  system is asked a series of questions via a GUI comprising: 1) text that asks the

  questions, and 2) either drop-down windows or input blanks to enter the answers

  to those questions; in **Porter**: see Figures 1 and 2; see Column 6, Lines 4-16;

see Column 6, Line 63 through Column 7, Line 27 – Porter discloses this

limitation in that the document assembly system includes data entry screens that

allow the user to input data in order to set the values of various data variables

within a document object);

- building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain knowledge (the

  examiner interprets this limitation to mean that the document assembly system

  includes a database of objects that is accessed to construct one or more

  documents by using the objects in the database; this database is "loosely

  coupled" to the system in that it stands alone and is independent from both the

  document assembly system and the documents constructed using that system; in

  Porter: see Figure 2; see Column 7, Lines 11-27 – Porter discloses this

  limitation in that the document assembly system includes a source code library

  comprising objects used to dynamically construct one or more documents based

  on the input data received from the user; the source code library is "loosely

  coupled" to the document assembly system); and

- linking said document knowledge to said domain knowledge, by linking said

  domain knowledge to document knowledge variables (the examiner interprets

  this limitation to mean that the document assembly system links the input

  received from the user, and thus the questions on the GUI, to objects in the

  database of objects; in **Porter**: see Figure 2; see Column 7, Line 11-27 – Porter

  discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes an input

  data structure that organizes the user input data into a set of variables that an

interpreter consults when determining the various documents to construct and

the content to include in the various documents; thus, the series of questions

presented to the user via a GUI is "linked" to the objects in the source code

library).

Claim 2:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said document knowledge

variables are linked to domain knowledge elements in said domain model, such that if

rules and constraints are tailored or developed to maintain consistency of the domain

model, the document model will be affected (see Column 7, Lines 24-27; Column 14,

Line 64 through Column 15, Line 67; see Column 17, Lines 23-55 – Porter discloses

this limitation in that the document assembly system allows a programmer to change

the rules that affect the content of constructed documents, and, when a programmer

does, the content of the structured documents are affected, as clearly indicated in the

cited text).

Claim 3:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein elements in the domain model

influence what appears in a rendered document (Porter discloses this limitation in that

the document assembly system *inherently* includes "elements in the domain model"

that "influence what appears in a rendered document" in that the objects in the source

code library are used to construct documents).

Claim 4:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain model comprises an explicit domain model which is reusable for a plurality of documents (the examiner interprets the phrase "explicit domain model" to mean that the domain model is loosely coupled to the document assembly system; in **Porter**: as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a source code library that is "loosely coupled" to the document assembly system and can thus be used to create many different types of documents).

Claim 5:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain model comprises an object-oriented domain model independent of any document to be rendered (the examiner interprets this phrase to be merely a restatement of Claim 4; in **Porter**: as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a source code library that is "loosely coupled" to the document assembly system; thus, the source code library is "independent of any document to be rendered"), said domain model being usable for any of a plurality of documents and consistency of the document model is maintained based on said linking (see Column 4, Line 16 through Column 5, Line 14; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 13, Line 24 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes a text generator and a form generator that construct many different types of documents using data input by the user and objects in the source code library, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

Claim 6:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein a plurality of documents are

configurable from the domain model (the examiner interprets this limitation to be merely

a restatement of Claim 4; in **Porter**: as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1,

Porter discloses a source code library that is "loosely coupled" to the document

assembly system; thus, the source code library is capable of "configuring a plurality of

documents").

Claim 7:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain model comprises a

stand-alone domain model, which is built separate and independent from a document

(the examiner interprets this limitation to be merely a restatement of Claim 4; in **Porter**:

as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a source code library

that is "loosely coupled" to the document assembly system; thus, the source code

library is a "stand-alone domain model" that is "separate and independent from a

document").

Claim 26:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain knowledge

comprises domain knowledge elements (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1,

Porter discloses a source code library that comprises objects), and said domain

knowledge elements are linked to said document knowledge variables (as indicated in

the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses questions presented to the user via the GUI that are "linked" to objects in the source code library).

Claim 27:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 26, wherein said domain knowledge elements are dynamically bound to said document knowledge variables through an object model access expression (the examiner interprets the phrase "object model access expression" to merely be the commands that establish the links generated at runtime between the questions presented to the user via the GUI and the objects in the database of objects; in **Porter:** as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation; in other words, the input data structure generated at runtime is generated by the commands that establish the links between the questions presented to the user via the GUI and the objects in the source code library).

Claim 28:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 27, wherein each of said document knowledge variables is assigned an object model access expression (see Figures 3-5; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 11, Line 20 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes a form generator and a text generator that comprise commands that handle each answer provided by the user via the GUI; these commands define when each object in the source code library will be used in the assembly of documents).

Claim 29:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 27, further comprising:

- enforcing the link between said domain knowledge and said document

    knowledge whenever a change occurs in at least one of said object model

    access expression of one of said document knowledge variables and said

    domain model (Porter discloses this limitation in that, because the commands

    define the links, the links between the domain knowledge and the document

    knowledge will ***inherently*** be "enforced" regardless of whether a change in the

    object model access expression is made; in other words, any change that is

    made in the input data structure will be "enforced" in the link between the objects

    in the database of objects and the questions on the GUI).

Claim 30:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 27, further comprising:

- evaluating the object model access expression of each of said document

    knowledge variables and linking them to appropriate domain knowledge

    elements whenever new document knowledge is inputted (as indicated in the

    above rejection for Claim 1, the source code library is "loosely coupled" to the

    document assembly system; thus, each time the user answers the questions

    presented via the GUI, the document assembly system runs the commands that

    establish the links between the questions and the objects in the source code

    library).

Claim 31:

   Porter discloses the method of Claim 27, further comprising:

- re-evaluating the object model access expression of each of said document

   knowledge variables whenever the domain model is reorganized (see Column

   17, Lines 23-55 –Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly

   system is modular and allows to a programmer to amend any part of the source

   code library; upon any amendment, the document assembly system will "re-

   evaluate" the commands that establish the links between the questions and the

   objects in the source code library because the source code library is "loosely

   coupled" to the document assembly system and is accessed every time a user

   answers the questions presented via the GUI).

Claim 32:

   Porter discloses the method of Claim 26, wherein said document knowledge

variables are linked to said domain knowledge elements by selecting a specific property

from the domain model by an object representation and access language, wherein said

object representation and access language comprises a plurality of oral expressions

(see Figures 3-5; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 11, Line 20 – Porter discloses

this limitation in that the document assembly system includes a form generator and a

text generator that comprise commands that handle each answer provided by the user

via the GUI and link each answer to the appropriate object and the corresponding

property in the source code library).

Claim 33:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 32, wherein if said oral expression

comprises a single identifier, the oral expression corresponds to a domain knowledge

element (see Figures 3-5; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 11, Line 20 – Porter

discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes a form

generator and a text generator that comprise commands that include only one identifier;

as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 32, each command corresponds to the

appropriate object and the corresponding property in the source code library).

Claim 34:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 32, wherein if said oral expression

comprises an identifier pre-appended to a second oral expression, the second oral

expression corresponds to a domain knowledge element, the identifier corresponds to a

property of the domain knowledge element and said oral expression corresponds to the

property of the domain knowledge element (see Figures 3-5; see Column 8, Line 15

through Column 11, Line 20 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document

assembly system includes a form generator and a text generator that comprise

commands that include one or more identifiers, and, as indicated in the cited figures and

text, each identifier points to an object in the source code library that includes options

comprising procedures that select the appropriate object and the corresponding

property from the source code library).

Claim 35:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 32, wherein if said oral expression

comprises an identifier pre-appended to a second oral expression, and the second oral

expression does not correspond to a domain knowledge element, said oral expression

does not correspond to anything (the examiner notes that this limitation is not definitely

recited; that is, the claim recites that *if* a condition is met, then an additional condition is

present; in other words, the claim does NOT positively recite that a condition *is* met and

therefore an additional condition is present; in **Porter:** as indicated in the above

rejection for Claim 34, Porter discloses a command embedded inside another

command; *if* the embedded command fails to select an object and the corresponding

property from the source code library, then the command, inside which the embedded

command is embedded, will also fail to select an object and the corresponding property

from the source code library).

Claim 36:

Porter discloses the method of Claim 32, wherein if said oral expression

comprises an identifier, and said identifier does not correspond to a domain knowledge

element, said oral expression does not correspond to anything (the examiner notes that

this limitation is not definitely recited; that is, the claim recites that *if* a condition is met,

then an additional condition is present; in other words, the claim does NOT positively

recite that a condition *is* met and therefore an additional condition is present; in **Porter:**

as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 34, Porter discloses a command that

includes only one identifier; *if* the identifier fails to cause a selection of an object and the

corresponding property from the source code library, then the command will fail to

select an object and the corresponding property from the source code library).

Claim 21:

Claim 21 merely recites a computer system for performing the method of Claim

1. Thus, Porter discloses every limitation of Claim 21 using the same rationale

indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

Claim 25:

Claim 25 merely recites computer software for performing the method of Claim 1.

Thus, Porter discloses every limitation of Claim 25 using the same rationale indicated in

the above rejection for Claim 1.

Claim 37:

The only difference between Claim 37 and Claim 1 is minor and included in the

preamble. Thus, Claim 37 corresponds to Claim 1. Accordingly, Porter discloses every

limitation of Claim 37 using the same rationale indicated in the above rejection for Claim

1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 14 June 2004 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Arguments for Claims 1, 21 and 25:

Applicant argues that Porter fails to disclose linking domain knowledge to

document knowledge variables. Specifically, Applicant argues that the present

invention provides a dynamic document-to-domain linkage that allows different domain

knowledge elements to be dynamically manipulated during the interactive configuration

of a document. Next, Applicant provides a broad, sweeping overview of the subject

matter disclosed in Porter, but fails to recognize everything that is disclosed in Porter.

See *Applicant's Response* – Pages 9-11.

The examiner disagrees.

Firstly, Applicant's argument fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because it

amounts to a general allegation that the claim defines a patentable invention without

specifically pointing out how the language of the claim patentably distinguishes it from

the reference. Simply stating that certain limitations of a claim are not disclosed in the

cited reference with no analysis of how the specific language of each limitation is

distinguishable from the subject matter disclosed in the cited reference fails to meet the

requirement of 37 CFR 1.111(b) that Applicant "specifically [point] out how the language

of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references." Instead, Applicant

simply argues, "it's not there."

Secondly, the examiner notes that Applicant appears to argue that Porter fails to disclose the *exact* wording of this limitation in Claims 1, 21 and 25. The examiner admits that this exact wording is not expressly disclosed in Porter. However, this fact does not make Claims 1, 21 and 25 patentable. As clearly explained in the above rejections of Claims 1, 21 and 25, Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes an input data structure that organizes the user input data into a set of variables that an interpreter consults when determining the various documents to construct and the content to include in the various documents (see Figure 2; see Column 7, Line 11-27). Thus, the series of questions presented to the user via a GUI is "linked" to the objects in the source code library. In other words, Porter discloses "a dynamic document-to-domain linkage that allows different domain knowledge elements to be dynamically manipulated during the interactive configuration of a document."

Regarding Applicant's remark that the dynamic linking of the present invention "allows the user to edit text as the user would in a regular word processor which maintaining constant and dynamic access to information provided by the document system" (see *Applicant's Response* – Page 10, first paragraph, third sentence), it is noted that this feature is not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-
4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00
PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)
872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-
2100.

WDH
November 19, 2004

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100